## 106TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

## H. R. 350

To improve congressional deliberation on proposed Federal private sector mandates, and for other purposes.

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

January 19, 1999

Mr. Condit (for himself, Mr. Portman, Mr. Moran of Virginia, Mr. Davis of Virginia, Mr. Bishop, Mr. Dreier, Ms. Danner, Mr. Hastert, Mr. Stenholm, Mr. Linder, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Armey, Mr. Hall of Texas, Mr. Goss, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Delay, Mr. Goode, Ms. Pryce of Ohio, Mr. Bentsen, Mr. Watts of Oklahoma, Mr. Tanner, Mr. Hastings of Washington, Mr. Turner, Mr. Kasich, Mrs. Myrick, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Bonilla, Mr. Boehner, Mr. Sununu, Mr. Riley, Mr. Hobson, Mr. Chabot, Mr. Norwood, and Mr. Hayes) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

## A BILL

To improve congressional deliberation on proposed Federal private sector mandates, and for other purposes.

- 1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
- 2 tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
- 3 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
- 4 This Act may be cited as the "Mandates Information
- 5 Act of 1999".
- 6 SEC. 2. FINDINGS.
- 7 Congress finds that—

- (1) before acting on proposed private sector mandates, Congress should carefully consider their effects on consumers, workers, and small businesses;
  - (2) Congress has often acted without adequate information concerning the costs of private sector mandates, instead focusing only on their benefits;
  - (3) the implementation of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 has resulted in increased awareness of intergovernmental mandates without impacting existing environmental, public health, or safety laws or regulations;
  - (4) the implementation of this Act will enhance the awareness of prospective mandates on the private sector without adversely affecting the environment, public health, or safety laws or regulations;
  - (5) the costs of private sector mandates are often borne in part by consumers, in the form of higher prices and reduced availability of goods and services;
  - (6) the costs of private sector mandates are often borne in part by workers, in the form of lower wages, reduced benefits, and fewer job opportunities; and

1	(7) the costs of private sector mandates are
2	often borne in part by small businesses, in the form
3	of hiring disincentives and stunted economic growth
4	SEC. 3. PURPOSES.
5	The purposes of this Act are—
6	(1) to improve the quality of Congress' delibera-
7	tion with respect to proposed mandates on the pri-
8	vate sector, by—
9	(A) providing Congress with more complete
10	information about the effects of such mandates
11	and
12	(B) ensuring that Congress acts on such
13	mandates only after focused deliberation or
14	their effects; and
15	(2) to enhance the ability of Congress to distin-
16	guish between private sector mandates that harm
17	consumers, workers, and small businesses, and man-
18	dates that help those groups.
19	SEC. 4. FEDERAL PRIVATE SECTOR MANDATES.
20	(a) In General.—
21	(1) Estimates.—Section 424(b) of the Con-
22	gressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 658c(b)) is
23	amended by adding at the end the following:
24	"(4) Estimate of indirect impacts.—

1	"(A) In General.—In preparing esti-
2	mates under paragraph (1), the Director shall
3	also estimate, if feasible, the impact (including
4	any disproportionate impact in particular re-
5	gions or industries) on consumers, workers, and
6	small businesses, of the Federal private sector
7	mandates in the bill or joint resolution
8	including—
9	"(i) an analysis of the effect of the
10	Federal private sector mandates in the bill
11	or joint resolution on consumer prices and
12	on the actual supply of goods and services
13	in consumer markets;
14	"(ii) an analysis of the effect of the
15	Federal private sector mandates in the bill
16	or joint resolution on worker wages, work-
17	er benefits, and employment opportunities
18	and
19	"(iii) an analysis of the effect of the
20	Federal private sector mandates in the bill
21	or joint resolution on the hiring practices.
22	expansion, and profitability of businesses
23	with 100 or fewer employees.
24	"(B) ESTIMATE NOT CONSIDERED IN DE-
25	TERMINATION.—The estimate prepared under

1	this paragraph shall not be considered in deter-
2	mining whether the direct costs of all Federal
3	private sector mandates in the bill or joint reso-
4	lution will exceed the threshold specified in
5	paragraph (1).".
6	(2) Point of order.—Section 424(b)(3) of
7	the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C.
8	658c(b)(3)) is amended by adding after the period
9	"If such determination is made by the Director, a
10	point of order under this part shall lie only under
11	section 425(a)(1) and as if the requirement of sec-
12	tion 425(a)(1) had not been met.".
13	(3) Threshold amounts.—Section 425(a) of
14	the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C.
15	658d(a)(2)) is amended—
16	(A) by striking "and" after the semicolon
17	at the end of paragraph (1) and redesignating
18	paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and
19	(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the
20	following new paragraph:
21	"(2) any bill, joint resolution, amendment, mo-
22	tion, or conference report that would increase the di-
23	rect costs of Federal private sector mandates (ex-
24	cluding any direct costs that are attributable to reve-

nue resulting from tax or tariff provisions of any

25

1	such measure if it does not raise net tax and tariff
2	revenues over the 5-fiscal-year period beginning with
3	the first fiscal year such measure affects such reve-
4	nues) by an amount that causes the thresholds spec-
5	ified in section 424(b)(1) to be exceeded; and"; and
6	(3) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated), by strik-
7	ing "Federal intergovernmental mandates by an
8	amount that causes the thresholds specified in sec-
9	tion 424(a)(1)" and inserting "Federal mandates by
10	an amount that causes the thresholds specified in
11	section 424 (a)(1) or (b)(1)".
12	(4) Application relating to appropria-
13	TIONS COMMITTEES.—Section 425(c)(1)(B) of the
14	Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C.
15	658d(c)(1)(B)) is amended—
16	(A) in clause (i) by striking "intergovern-
17	mental";
18	(B) in clause (ii) by striking "intergovern-
19	mental";
20	(C) in clause (iii) by striking "intergovern-
21	mental"; and
22	(D) in clause (iv) by striking "intergovern-
23	mental".
24	(5) Application relating to congres-
25	SIGNAL DUDGET OFFICE Section 197 of the Con-

- 1 gressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 658f) is
- amended by striking "intergovernmental".
- 3 (b) Rules of the House of Representatives.—
- 4 Clause 11(b) of rule XVIII of the Rules of the House of
- 5 Representatives is amended by striking "intergovern-
- 6 mental" and by striking "section 424(a)(1)" and inserting
- 7 "section 424(a)(1) or (b)(1)".
- 8 (c) Exercise of Rulemaking Powers.—This sec-
- 9 tion is enacted by Congress—
- 10 (1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of
- 11 the Senate and the House of Representatives, re-
- spectively, and as such they shall be considered as
- part of the rules of such House, respectively, and
- such rules shall supersede other rules only to the ex-
- tent that they are inconsistent therewith; and
- 16 (2) with full recognition of the constitutional
- 17 right of either House to change such rules (so far
- as relating to such House) at any time, in the same
- manner, and to the same extent as in the case of
- any other rule of each House.
- 21 SEC. 5. FEDERAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL MANDATE.
- Section 421(5)(B) of the Congressional Budget and
- 23 Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 658(5)(B))
- 24 is amended—
- 25 (1) by striking "the provision" after "if";

1	(2) in clause (i)(I) by inserting "the provision"
2	before "would";
3	(3) in clause (i)(II) by inserting "the provision"
4	before "would"; and
5	(4) in clause (ii)—
6	(A) by inserting "that legislation, statute,
7	or regulation does not provide" before "the
8	State"; and
9	(B) by striking "lack" and inserting "new
10	or expanded".

 $\bigcirc$